



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/826,009

04/16/2004

Mohamad El-Batal

LSI.96US01 (03-2331)

9215

24319

7590

04/28/2008

LSI CORPORATION  
1621 BARBER LANE  
MS: D-106  
MILPITAS, CA 95035

EXAMINER

FRANKLIN, RICHARD B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2181

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/28/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/826,009	<b>Applicant(s)</b> EL-BATAL, MOHAMAD	
	<b>Examiner</b> RICHARD FRANKLIN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2181	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) RICHARD FRANKLIN. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Samuel M. Freund (Reg. No. 30,459). (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 21 April 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-18.

Identification of prior art discussed: Riggle.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant stated that Riggles teaching of maximizing was not actually a teaching. Applicant has interpreted col 5 lines 26 - 28 as stating that the system of Riggle does not operate at the levels described. The Examiner stated that even if the passage is interpreted as such, Riggle still discloses operating at maximum levels. The applicant and examiner were unable to come up with a solution to move the claims forward in prosecution.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Richard Franklin/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2181

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. Examiner's signature, if required